‘Mediating a Global Capitalist, Speciesist Moral Vacuum: How Two Escaped Pigs disrupted Dyson Appliances’ State of Nature’

Matthew David (Durham University) & Nathan Stephens Griffin (Northumbria University)

Abstract

In 1998, two Tamworth Ginger pigs escaped on-route to slaughter, remaining fugitive for over a week on Dyson Appliances’ land in Malmesbury, Wiltshire, England, the United Kingdom. *Dyson* factory workers helped search for them, and media interest was global. National UK newspaper *The Daily Mail* bought the animals, preventing their slaughter. Whilst two pigs dubbed “Butch” and “Sundance” were publicly “saved,” slaughter continued in private, justified as “natural.” *Dyson Appliance’s* subsequent decision to sack all 800 Malmesbury vacuum-cleaner production staff was likewise reported as an inevitable, natural consequence of the market. *The Press Gazette* voted *The Daily Mail’s* coverage of the Tamworth two the greatest British media scoop of all time. Adopting a Critical Animal Media Studies lens, we explore the contradictions and connections between moral identification in UK media framing of Malmesbury’s animal escape story, moral invisibility of animal-slaughter in general, and reporting of the factory’s closure as a global capitalist state of nature’s “inevitable” and “natural” consequence.

Keywords:

Animal Escape/Protection Stories, Critical Animal Media Studies, Critical Theory, Capitalist Globalization, Moral Identification/Invisibility, Naturalisation.

Introduction

In the midst of the Covid 19 pandemic's first wave, *The* [UK] *Sunday Times* released its annual rich list (Sunday Times, 2020). Top of the list was vacuum cleaner and hand dryer manufacturer Sir James Dyson. As the virus threatened to overwhelm health services, Sir James promised to rapidly invent and mass-produce a new generation of medical ventilators. This did not happen. Dyson Appliances had outsourced production, having closed the company's UK factory in 2002/3 and relocated production to lower cost cites in Malaysia and the Philippines. This is the story of that closure, the workers sacrificed to the myth of the market, and two pigs that resisted that fate.

The pigs, dubbed the "Tamworth two" escaped whilst being moved from the back of a van into Malmesbury's *Newman's* slaughterhouse. The pair managed to get under a fence and then crossed the river Avon into an area of trees, grass and scrub. That land had only recently then been purchased by Dyson Appliances. After the Tamworth two escaped in 1998, *The Daily Mail* (hereafter, *The Mail*) proclaimed the need to "save our pigs." British national newspapers located the story of the pigs within divergent editorial frameworks even amidst their near universal consensus for 'saving' the pair. Editors and headline writers feasted on puns. Even the *BBC* "caught swine fever." Media coverage enabled the fate of two pigs to be revised, and celebrated their protection, whilst ignoring ongoing, routine large-scale animal slaughter (Morgan & Cole, 2011). On January 15th, the weekly *Wilts and Gloucestershire Standard's* Ella Cservenka (1998a, para. 8) reported town police constable PC Bull's claim, that: "This is obviously a well planned escape". A week later she reported: "A sweep-search of the town was planned last week by staff at Dyson vacuum manufacturers in Malmesbury in a bid to track down the run-away Sundance [the last of the pair to be caught]" (Cservenka, 1998b, p. 5). Moral attachment was mobilised in the media to rescue the pigs, but the same mobilisation did not happen for the Dyson staff who had helped in the rescue. When Dyson Appliances later

announced its Malmesbury factory's closure, media coverage framed events as the inevitable logic of natural market forces.

In telling this story and linking these seemingly separate cases we hope to emphasize the importance of a joined-up approach in awareness-raising animal advocacy campaigns. Speciesism and global capitalism are intrinsically linked and as such our struggles against them should be too. As Upton Sinclair (1906[1985], pp. 376-377) describes the commodification of human and other animals; "it was the Great Butcher, it was the spirit of capitalism made flesh"; a horror and a threat, evoking empathy and demanding action in equal measure. This article first summarizes local context, presents a critical animal media studies approach, details Malmesbury's escaped pigs and their UK media-framing before analysing this media-framing. Media-framing of Dyson's vacuum-cleaner production's relocation to Malaysia is then outlined. The contradictions of rationality within modernity are then explored.

The two pigs escaped in 1998, onto land bought by Dyson Appliances the year before with a view to expanding production. However, when told in 1999 that planning permission might take up to a year, the company began a pilot project in Malaysia. This was operational by mid-2000. All production relocated there in 2002 despite all subsequent planning applications for the Malmesbury site being granted. Journalists' names will be given when present in the original news source. Except where stated otherwise, newspapers referenced in this article are British national publications. National British newspapers tend to be divided into the categories of broadsheets (such as the *Telegraph* and the *Guardian*), which deal with more serious news reporting; "red tops" tabloids (such as the *Sun* and the *Daily Mirror*), which lack the credibility of broadsheets and tend to focus on sensational stories and are distinguished by their red mast heads; and "middle market tabloids" (such as the *Daily Mail* and the *Daily Express*), which are often understood as a mid-way point between broadsheets and "red top"

tabloids, dealing with a combination of serious issues and entertainment (Stephens Griffin, 2020).

Historical Context

North Wiltshire is famous for "Wiltshire Cure Ham." The county's largest town is Swindon (Swine town). Calne, a short distance southwest of Swindon, became the country's largest center for pork-processing from the 18th-20th century – of both local animals and those imported to Bristol from Ireland and then slaughtered on route to London. Wiltshire cure ham was developed in Calne to store pork (being soaked in brine for five days to preserve the meat). With the closure of Calne's *Harris and Co*. in 1983, Chippenham became the center of pork processing.

Two months before the "Tamworth Two" escaped the Italian Parma ham producers' association took the UK supermarket chain ASDA to the European Court of Justice (ECJ). ASDA used a Chippenham based company to process meat bought from Parma. The Parma producers claimed the Parma appellation required both rearing and processing be in Parma. ASDA counterclaimed, stating that rearing was sufficient to warrant the application. The initial recommendation of the Court in 2002 was in ASDA's favour. As per Dyson's factory closure announced only weeks before, the market was prioritized over protection. A year later however, the final decision of the Court reversed its recommendation. The "saved pigs" moved to Chippenham. Parma ham processing ceased. The affix "-ham" in Chippenham does not refer to cured-pork, but rather to a flat area largely enclosed/protected by a river. Whilst the affix "-ham" relates to social protection, "Chipp-" derives from "ceap", the Saxon word for market. The cases of Chippenham versus Parma Ham, the "Tamworth Two", and the closure of Malmesbury's vacuum-cleaner factory show the primacy of protection or the primacy of the market - whether for pigs or people - is a choice, not an inevitability.

Capitalism, Animals and the Media

Nibert (2017) argues that there is a fundamental connection between the systematic oppression of animals, the environment, and the relentless everyday harms caused to humans under capitalism. Best (2009, p. 42): argues that "the profit imperative overwhelms the moral imperative; value is reduced to exchange value… [C]apitalism devours nature, species, human lives, and indigenous cultures." The scale at which animals are slaughtered is staggering, with 70 billion animals killed every year for food, according to the UN (Sanders, 2018). Cudworth (2015, p. 14) argues; "violence towards domesticated animals is routinized, systemic and legitimated. It is embedded in structures of authority, such as the nation state, and in formations of social domination." Taylor (2016) explores the way these overlapping systems of domination play out across the media landscape, and has encouraged more focus on the media processes by which animals are represented as being expendable objects. The Tamworth two represent a case whereby "special" animals are conferred subjectivity in the media, crossing over the "subject-object divide" allowing them to no longer be viewed as "food" (Morgan & Cole, 2011, p. 126). While Morgan and Cole rightly identify manifestations of what Stan Cohen calls "techniques of denial" in media coverage of the Tamworth Two, such texts are not monolithic and afford divergent readings. It is for activists to promote such alternative readings, and such high-profile coverage creates useful spaces for such interpretive counterwork.

Almiron et al. (2018, p. 374) discusses Critical Media Studies' (CMS) efforts to highlight the role of the media in manufacturing consent for mainstream ideologies and systems of domination; however, the "entanglements of violence affecting other animals have been a blind spot for CMS." They therefore call for a Critical Animal Media Studies (CAMS) sub-discipline to address the traditional neglect of research on animals in critical communication studies. Using Almiron et al.'s (2018) CAMS lens to revisit media coverage of the Tamworth two, and subsequent media coverage of Dyson Appliances*'* decision to relocate manufacturing

to Malaysia, reveals a fascinating case study in the relationship between capitalism and animal oppression. Appeals to nature are employed to justify each, but such justifications can be disrupted.

During archival research on *Dyson* planning applications in The Wiltshire and Swindon History Centre, an archivist gave one of the authors a file of 'Tamworth two" national and local newspaper cuttings from 1998. This initial data set was supplemented by a keyword search (using 'Tamworth two") of later newspaper coverage via online archives. Newspaper and broadcast coverage of the factory closure was collected using a manual search of local newspaper micro-fiche archives (held by the above *History Centre*), and an online search of national coverage. Small by comparison to Elena Lazutkaite's (2020) 1754 texts published over 38 years, our sample of 27 articles was only of UK national daily newspaper coverage of the "Tamworth Two" (*Guardian, Times, Telegraph, Mail, Express, Mirror, Sun, Star, Financial Times* and *Independent*), and of regional titles (*Wilts and Gloucestershire Standard* and *The Western Daily Press*) in the immediate period during which events were unfolding. One article from the London based, but nationally read *London Evening Standard*, a BBC radio feature from the time and one retrospective newspaper article from 2004 are also referred to.

Headlines were analyzed intuitively for metaphorical language; images were analyzed semiotically in relation to the prior theoretical frame (of facial identification); whilst all text was then interrogated using inductive thematic analysis – the search for emergent themes. Those emerging were: *naming* and identification; *framing* within prior editorial positions; and *narrative* development (storytelling and intentionality). For a further discussion of multiple modes of qualitative data-analysis, see David and Sutton (2011, chapter 20, pp. 361-387).

Media Accounts and (In)visibility

On Thursday January 8, 1998, Arnoldo Dijulio, a local council road cleaner, took three Tamworth Ginger pigs to Malmesbury's *Newman's Slaughterhouse*. Mr Dijulio had reared the

three piglets in his three-acre smallholding, and at five months old he was taking them for slaughter, expecting to be paid £40 each for the three animals.

Tamworths (sometimes called Sandy Backs or Tams) are a rare and ancient breed of ginger colored pigs. They are often selected for garden rearing as they are relatively small, but grow rapidly – reaching near full development after only a few months (Mizelle, 2015). Such home reared animals in the Western world have declined in number as health and safety regulations have led to most small-scale, local slaughterhouses having closed in recent decades (Mizelle, 2015). Most large-scale industrial slaughterhouses will not deal with small numbers of pigs as in Mr Dijulio's three. In fact, *Newman's Slaughterhouse* closed in 2004 after repeated health and safety inspection failures. On arrival at *Newman's* the three pigs were unloaded. In the process of being moved from Mr Dijulio's van to the slaughterhouse building, two of the animals escaped.

Newman's was located at the bottom of Tetbury Hill. Tetbury Hill was also the site where Dyson Appliances had relocated itself in 1995, having established its original assembly line in Chippenham in 1992. In 1997, Dyson Appliances received planning permission to extend its factory and car park on land next to its existing site. It was into this abandoned and largely overgrown waste ground that the pigs escaped. The pigs evaded capture on their first day, and their story was picked up on by a group of national and international journalists in the area at the time awaiting an announcement from Prince Charles, whose home is situated between Malmesbury and Tetbury, regarding his relationship with Camilla Parker Bowles following the death of Princess Diana in 1997. The pigs' continued ability to evade capture allowed the story to escalate to the point where over one hundred print and broadcast journalists were stationed in Dyson Appliances*'* car park looking to get an angle on the situation. Despite editorial differences, these "angles" shared a common celebration of the animals' escape, and support for their being, in some sense, "saved."

After a week, Butch was caught, and the next day Sundance was also captured with assistance from Dyson Appliances workers. *The Mail* paid Mr Dejulio for the animals. Butch and Sundance were then taken to Kevin and Debbie Stinchcombe's *Langley Wild Animal Rescue Centre* in Chippenham. Dyson Appliances had moved from Chippenham to Malmesbury in 1995. Contra wise, Butch and Sundance moved from Malmesbury over to Chippenham. As has been noted above, Chippenham means both protected space and open market. Whilst Butch and Sundance were saved from the market by the extension of moral protection to them, the workers who helped save them were sacrificed to the supposedly morally neutral market.

Media Accounts of the Tamworth Two

Camera crews, photographers and journalists arrived in the days following Butch and Sundance's escape. Television crews from the *BBC*, *ITV* (who hired a helicopter), *NBC*, *CNN*, *Sky TV*, *France2* and *LCI*, and two Japanese TV channels came. Local, national and international radio broadcasters also arrived. At least a dozen national newspapers sent teams, some with five to seven people each.

Regional paper, *The Western Daily Press's* Wendy Best was first to go to print on 13 January 1998. Geraint Smith, a reporter sent to cover the story by *The London Evening Standard*, and who stayed at Malmesbury's *Old Bell Hotel* (allegedly England's oldest) claimed (14 January 1998) he could only eat cornflakes at breakfast: "I couldn't eat them one minute and interview them the next. I was offered bacon but I could not face it." (Cservenka, 1998b, p. 5) The *London Evening Standard* published the first "exclusive interview" with the two pigs – a fabrication complete with imagery of two pigs in dark glasses (Vallely, 1998). A feast of puns ensued:

Pun based headline	**Source**	**Author, Date, Page**
"Pig of a day for press gang", and "Tamworth hunt ends after pig of a day"	*The Times*	Simon De Bruxelles, 17 January 1998, p. 1-2
"Pig knocks stuffing out of police", and "Swimming boars save their bacon"	*Daily Telegraph*	Sean O'Neill, 14 January 1998, p. 4
"World Oinksclusive: How the Mail saved the bacon of the Tamworth Two"	*Daily Mail*	Paul Harris, 16 January 1998, p. 2
"Three Little Piggies went to Market, but two went on the run. They saved their bacon, with a swim in the Avon; and now the farmer looks glum."	*The Western Daily Press*	Wendy Best, 13 January 1998, p. 3
"Piggies on the run to save their bacon", "Hog hunt brings home the bacon", "Swine fever", "Pigmania", "The great escape – a snort by snort account"	*Wilts and Gloucestershire Standard*	Ella Cservenka, 22 January 1998, p. 5
"Tamworth One cops it in copse ending great escape"	*Guardian*	Geoff Gibbs, 17 January 1998, p. 1
"The grunt escape", and "How the flying pigs became a crackling good tale"	*Independent*	Paul Vallely, 17 January 1998, p. 16
" A crackling good yarn"	*Guardian*	Steven Morris, 1 March 2004, online

"Market awaits news on pork futures,"	*Financial Times*	Julia Jowit, 17 January 1998, p. 1

Table 1: A Feast of Puns

The use of puns in so many article titles (see Table 1) highlights contradiction in attitudes to pigs. Even as readers are encouraged to identify with the animals, "pig" is a negative euphemism for a police officer, a "pig of a day" is a bad day, even as "swine fever" and "Pigmania" equate pigs with madness. Bacon is "saved", but in different accounts, the pigs save themselves, are themselves saved, or else the hunt is successful in catching the pigs. "The Great Escape" puns identify the pigs with prisoners of war escaping Nazi tyranny in the film of the same name, even as the play on cracking and "crackling" equates virtue with roasted pig skin, and "Pork Futures" parallels speculation on whether the pigs would escape death, and that of profiting from investments in butchered meat.

Michael Hornsby entitled one article: "Tamworth Two 'were right to flee abattoir"' (30 January) due to a poor health and safety inspection of *Newman's*. The article cited Jeff Rooker, the then Food Safety Minister as claiming: "We have now discovered why the two Tamworth pigs, Butch and Sundance, did escape. They decided they did not want to be chopped up in a low-scoring abattoir." This flippant assertion presupposes that the pigs would have been content being killed in a more "hygienic" slaughterhouse (1998, para 3).

The Independent, true to its self-styled impartiality (or indifference) ran one story on January 15th (Garner, 1998) in line with the liberation narrative; whilst on January 17th it ran another lengthy article castigating "animal daft England" for its anthropomorphism; citing a Leicester University psychology lecturer on animal naming and an Oxford professor of animal theology who blamed Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas in equal measure (Vallely, 1998, p. 17).

The Sun was adamant that the story, once again, illustrated the superiority of the "Great British Public" in coming to the rescue of the two escaped pigs, and recalled its involvement

in saving "Blackie" the Donkey in 1987. *The Sun* claimed that they had saved Blackie from being crushed to death by "six fat Spanish men" in a supposedly traditional Spanish ritual commemorating the execution of a medieval rapist. In 1987 *The Daily Star* had managed to somehow appropriate Blackie the Donkey from *The Sun,* and deliver him to a donkey sanctuary (Baird, 2010). This coverage was marked in its racism, Europhobia and jingoistic British nationalism. For example, to celebrate bringing Blackie home *The Daily Star* ran as its front-page headline the word 'GOTCHA!' (Baird, 2010). Innocuous though this may seem, this was actually a jocular reference to a headline *The Sun* had run during the Falklands war, triumphantly celebrating Britain's sinking of an Argentine ship in which 368 people died, many teenage conscripts (Horrie, 2002), imbuing this supposedly light-hearted dig at their rival newspaper with a morbid nationalist significance and imperialist symbolism.

Colling (2020) discusses the way that animal exploitation and resistance should be understood within the social conditions of oppression, especially the intertwined processes of domestication, colonialism and capitalism. Through this lens, these narratives of animal salvation can invariably be read as an attempt to emphasise British moral superiority, often as compared to the 'barbarism' of others. In Blackie's case, the comparator was Spain, and the coverage reinforced prevalent right-wing nationalist and Europhobic sentiments at the time, the sort that have continued to dominate the British news media landscape since (Partington & Zuccato, 2018). Indeed, Gillespie & Narayanan (2020, p. 3) argue that non-human subjects have "long been entangled with global cultural politics of nation-building and nationalism".

On reading the early report in *The Western Daily Press*, the team at *The Mail* set out to rescue the Tamworth two. It was also *The Mail* who coined the nicknames Butch and Sundance. *The Mail* was keen to ensure that its rival, *The Daily Express (*hereafter, *The Express*), did not do to it what *The Daily Star* had done to *The Sun* eleven years earlier. In 2009, *The Press Gazette* voted *The Mail's* handling of the Tamworth two the greatest British media scoop of all

time (Wilson, 2012). News editor Ian MacGregor dispatched freelance journalist Barbara Davies to capture the pigs, telling her not to come back if she did not succeed (Morris, 2004). Davies recruited the Stinchcombes (owners of *The Langley Wild Animal Rescue Center*) to aid in the capture. Staying up all night, Davies and the Stinchcombes managed to capture Butch on January 15th.

The Express assigned two reporters (one the former parachute regiment officer Sean Rayment), who had already agreed on a price with Mr Dejulio's family. *The Mail's* team, with Butch in their possession told Mr Dejulio they would run a photo of Butch the next day, so undoing his contract with *The Express*. Other journalists were allegedly banging on the door of Mr Dejulio's house with checks for tens of thousands of pounds and the "poacher's pockets" of their wax jackets wedged with cash (Morris, 2004). Eventually, Mr Dejulio signed the pigs over to *The Mail*.

The paper then sent its top writer, Paul Harris, to interview Butch (Harris, "WORLD OINKSCLUSIVE: The Mail Saves the Bacon of the Tamworth Two," 16 January 1998, p. 2), who, allegedly said: "I caught a glimpse of the Daily Mail girl [Davies], a redhead like me, and I knew I was in safe hands" (see Cudworth (2008) for a pertinent discussion of the gendered objectification of women and animals). A rival journalist parked his car behind Davies' four-wheel drive, preventing her from being able to capture Sundance, who was caught on January 16, 1998 by a team from the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA) and a local pig breeder. Sundance was taken to the local veterinarian, where the press pack descended. Davies asserted "exclusive rights" and tried to get PC Bull to seal off the area. However, she could not produce a receipt. Donatella Lorch of *NBC* (veteran of Iraq and Rwanda) demanded access in the name of press freedom. 250 million Americans had a right to know, she asserted. However, she was denied access by the vet. Sundance was later smuggled out of Malmesbury to be united with Butch at the Stintchcombe's Chippenham sanctuary.

The Mail's royal photographer, Mike Forrester, wanted to photograph the pair looking out over a stable door at the Stinchcombes'. However, the pigs were too small to reach the top. A carpenter was found to shorten the door and the desired front facial shot was created (Morris, 2004). An analysis of images in the different news-titles shows the same pattern—all pro-escape stories use facial shots. However, three pro-escape stories contained side-on images, each of which show the pigs running away. One pro-animal story even had a backside photograph again showing the animal "getting away." As such, whilst Molloy (2011) is correct in her account of how facial shots can foster identification with animals, it is also possible to complement a pro-animal story with a side shot or even a backside image.

The Independent article that was fundamentally hostile to "animal daft England" carried eight side-on line-drawn outlines of generic pigs. They were in a pose that suggests running, and were located within an image presenting the time-line of the escape-rescue in the form of a board game. However, these side-on outlines also resembled the silhouettes of pigs shown in butcher shops where various cuts can then be displayed. Whilst front-on face shots may afford "identification," in context side-on imagery, and even a backside shot, can do likewise. It is not the image, in isolation, that gives meaning (David and Sutton, 2011, p. 430). For further discussion of the role of images in encouraging humans to identify with animals, in particular the significance of images of animal suffering, see Jenni (2005).

Morris (2004) lists where the six key journalists who participated in *The Mail/Express* rivalry over the pigs were working six years on. One stayed at the *The Mail*, and one switched from *The Express* to *The Mail*. The others had moved to *The Guardian, Mirror, London Evening Standard* and *Telegraph*. *The Mail* and *The Express* are right-wing tabloids and *The Daily Mirror* left-wing. *The Telegraph* and *The Guardian* position themselves on the political right and left respectively. As Schattschneider (1960) notes, pluralism is only window dressing if the apparent left-right diversity of voices in fact come from one common pool of people.

When Dyson Appliances' Malmesbury vacuum-cleaner production workers, who had helped find the pigs were made redundant, overwhelmingly press coverage reported this as inevitable. Media pluralism: and pigs might fly!

Accounting for the Media

Animals are a recurring feature of human story telling in all times and cultures (DeMello 2012). Animals are routinely presented in human stories as heroic, and justified in their resistance to humans. Animals are used to present particular social arrangements as natural, to present a nostalgic version of the past, or to individualize actions; thereby often rendering systemic realities invisible. Contemporary media representations contain all these elements, and so represent a space of illusion, contradiction and of potential provocation.

Cole and Stewart discuss Burger King's "happy meal" tie-in with animated film *Chicken Run*:

> Burger King offered promotional tie-ins… allowing children to take home a toy representation of the characters with which they had been invited to identify, while simultaneously consuming actual animals who had been subject to the very fate the film's heroes had fought against (2014, p. 3).

Molloy (2011) lists fourteen box office blockbuster films between 2001 and 2009, featuring animal protagonists, which each grossed over a hundred million US dollars. In all but one of these films, the animals are "the heroes." In many cases humans are the villains, against which the animals justly hide from, resist or escape. Even when animals are presented as a threat to humans, this threat is shown originating in the way humans have mistreated them.

Pig escape stories, like E.B. White's *Charlotte's Web* and Dick King-Smith's *The Sheep Pig* (the basis for the film *Babe*), Brett Mizelle (2015) writes, focus on individuals "saved from slaughter", as these do not challenge us to address the routine nature of mass slaughter.

Mizelle notes the contrast between traditional, small-scale, family farm based, nostalgic and romantic representations of pig rearing, slaughter and sale, relative to the reality of today's industrial meat production system. Mass production is largely invisible. Factory farm buildings and slaughterhouses adopt a uniformly anonymous and windowless architectural style to preserve this invisibility (for a compelling Green Criminological exploration of the connections between slaughterhouses and prisons, see Fitzgerald, 2012). Gould (2019) argues that animal slaughter's move from relative visibility in urban areas to the invisibility of windowless rural buildings, parallels cinematic portrayals of animal slaughter, which have shifted from displaying real animal death to now almost never showing the moment when an animal is killed.

Joy (2010, p. 103) suggests media coverage of meat production serves to "reinforce this invisibility of the system," through omission, prohibition and aberration. Routine is, by definition, not news. However, when activists publicize the brutality of this routine, animal farming based organizations lobby to prevent such work being broadcast/printed. For example, in the UK, a campaign funded by the Vegan Society to promote "Veganuary" (going vegan in January), did get coverage in media and on billboards. However, this was then framed in some media sources in terms either of "harming" various economic sectors (restaurants, pubs, shops and farms) or as being "disloyal" to British farmers (e.g. Gill, *The Telegraph*: "'Veganuary' blamed for January pub hangover," 19 February 2019, para 1). Finally, when a scandal breaks, damage limitation is sought through presenting particular cases as exceptions, aberrations, and the results of particular failings, not systemic ones (Joy, 2010, p. 104).

"Ag-gag-laws" make it hard for slaughterhouse employees to talk (Mizelle, 2015). Media outlets receive advertizing revenues from a food industry which would not fund any channel or title that highlighted significant criticism of the meat industry. Even Oprah Winfrey was sued for "libelling beef" (Joy, 2010, p. 91). Martin (2014) argues that, in this context,

images of farmed animals in modern agricultural settings can represent contested sites of education, critically exploring the possibilities and limitations of such deployments. These contested sites arguably also provide an ideal space within which to challenge the exploitation of workers which is intrinsic to global capitalism, and to draw connections between the exploitation inherent in both animal agriculture and global capitalism.

Most people still eat meat, yet few want to see how meat is produced. The industrialization of meat production produces more meat and, yet, paradoxically perhaps, even amongst those that can afford to eat meat, a greater proportion choose to be vegans/vegetarians today. How is that possible?

Market "Inevitability" and Naturalization

Returning to Dyson Appliances*'* sacked workers, the claim, repeatedly made, was that the relocation of vacuum-cleaner production from Malmesbury to Malaysia was "inevitable." James Dyson, told the *The Guardian's* Geoffrey Gibbs: "We don't want to present them [the workers] with a fait accompli, but I have to say that the end decision is fairly inevitable" (Gibbs, 2002, para. 15). Sir Richard Needham, the former MP for Malmesbury, was the deputy "chairman [sic]" of Dyson Appliances in 2002. Needham told the *Devizes Gazzete and Hereld's* Derek Valler: "Looking at our future made us realise with stark intensity that we could not hope to survive if we stayed making our mass market cleaners in Wiltshire." (Valler, 2002, p. 10)

Robert Uhlig (2002, online), then the business and technology correspondent for *The Telegraph*, repeated the company's "inevitability" line. Uhlig sets an earlier quote from James Dyson – that, "I do not believe that the nation that was the home to the Industrial Revolution can remain great if it loses the ability to make things" - against the following claim: "Yesterday he [Dyson] was forced to abandon his beliefs to the economic imperative." Uhlig further cites

James Dyson as saying: “I agonised over it particularly because I put so much faith in manufacturing in Britain, but the decision became inevitable when I looked at the facts.” It is an objective thing out there to be observed that compelled the course of action that was undertaken. Where denying responsibility for an outcome avoids liabilities it is framed as an external reality, existing beyond human action and control, a discovery to be found “out there.”

Production foreman [sic] Bob Tidey told the *Devizes Gazette and Herald*: “I think the cost of making the vacuum-cleaners on this site is spiralling out of control, so the move is inevitable.” (Valler, 2002, p. 10) A letter to the *Devizes Gazette and Herald* on February 21st, entitled “Firm not to Blame,” blamed Malmesbury’s high wages, productivity issues and planning barriers, concluding “what did they expect?” given cheaper and more flexible alternatives. Such “inevitability” was only questioned once (a year later). David Gow (2003), writing in *The Guardian*, reported trade union leader Roger Lyon’s claim that British consumers put Dyson where he was in 2002, not overseas markets. At the time, the decision was represented as just a “thing” that had to be done. The *BBC* (2002, para 1) reported the then UK Prime Minister: “Blair ‘disappointed’ over Dyson jobs,” but that he accepted the market should decide.

Yet, no external market pressure actually existed. In 2000/2001 Dyson Appliances won court cases against *Hoover*. These court decisions upheld Dyson Appliances’ patent monopoly (for a limited period) despite the fact that James Dyson’s original 1980/81 patents should have elapsed after twenty years. Hoover was forced to put-off production of bag-less cyclone vacuum cleaners. Entrenching Dyson Appliances’ monopoly further, this market-suspension was upheld globally through the WTO’s TRIPS Treaty, and Dyson Appliances immediately cancelled its dual-cyclone licencing agreements in North America to capitalize further on this global protection, so removing choice there to buy any but its branded bag-less products. Interestingly, the original Dyson patent was issued three years after a Japanese patent for a root

cyclone vacuum cleaner design had been granted (Pearce, 2009). Under today's TRIPS rules Dyson's original patent would never have been granted. No planning application was denied, preventing expansion of production in Malmesbury so as to keep up with the increased demand caused by the enforced suspension of alternative production. Relocation simply reduced labor costs. Where the Tamworth two were saved, the workers were framed in the media as inevitable victims of a fictional market, global capitalism's imaginary "jungle out there," even as the company benefited from global monopoly protection.

What Cammaerts (2015) calls neoliberalism presents its own negative consequences as an inevitable "state of nature," not as parts of a hegemonic order to which alternatives exist. Cammaerts (2015, p. 522) observes that "the neoliberal project is geared towards making itself invisible, positioning itself as quintessentially anti-ideological and natural." In other words, where choices are made which negatively impact workers, they are justified as being an inevitable consequence of the market, which is itself presented as "natural." The original author of this "nasty, brutish and short" representation of the "state of nature" is of course Thomas Hobbes, or as he signed his name, and as his name appears on the famous 1651 frontispiece of his book *Leviathan*, "Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury". This article is one locally sourced challenge to that locally produced but now globally circulating myth.

Joy (2010) uses the term carnism to describe the ideology, which allows people to support animal exploitation. Exploitation of certain animals is justified on the grounds that it is "natural," "normal," "necessary," and "nice" (Joy, 2010). Consumption of pigs is generally understood as natural in the West, in contrast with consumption of dog meat, which is understood as abnormal, cruel and barbaric (Joy, 2010). The media plays a central role in the ideological reproduction of contingent choices as natural, inevitable and invisible.

Technology and the Free Market

Mizelle documents the development of the Chicago slaughterhouses in the period after the U.S. Civil War. These slaughterhouses were proud of their efficient killing and highly rationalized dis-assembling of animals. One such firm, *Swift & Company,* even ran public tours. Chapter three of Upton Sinclair's (1906[1985]) *The Jungle* offers a fictionalized account of just such a Chicago slaughterhouse (called Durhams) promotional tour. Today, Mizelle suggests, such openness has all but disappeared.

According to TheHenryFord.Org website, when telling the story of Henry Ford's adoption of the "assembly line" in the production of his Model T cars, it was a visit to *Swift & Company,* and the observation of its "dis-assembly line" that inspired him. The example serves to further underline the connection between capitalism and animal exploitation highlighted by Nibert (2017). As Upton Sinclair characterized the relationship:

> There is but scant account kept of cracked heads in back of the yards, for men who have to crack the heads of animals all day seem to get into the habit, and to practice on their friends, and even on their families between times. This makes it a cause for congratulation that by modern methods very few men do the painfully necessary work of head-cracking for the whole of the civilised world (1906[1985], p. 24).

It should be noted that Sinclair was being ironic in his use of both the word's *necessary* and *civilised*.

Joy (2010) suggests technology distances us from the consequences of our actions. Animals are objectified as things ("Live Stock," "Units" or "Parts"), de-individualized as numbers without names, and packaged symbolically (categorized) as food by a mechanized process. Joy argues this is how we can love dogs, eat pigs and wear cows without confronting the paradoxical difference in how we relate to each. Subsumed under nameless abstractions

and industrially "processed" (bred, raised, killed and dis-assembled) in unimaginable numbers, animals are rendered invisible, even as they are *rendered* invisibly (Shaffer & Young, 2015).

However, the dialectic of enlightenment (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1997; Maurizi, 2012) Joy parallels above must have its reverse. Whilst Bauman (1989) is correct to say that modern genocide can only be as lethal as it is because it applies the most modern principals of bureaucracy, division of labour and techno-scientific methods, this is not the inevitable end of rationalization (for further discussion of these ideas see Cudworth, 2015; Davis, 2004; Painter, 2014).

Cole and Stewart (2014, p. 16) classify human and non-human animal interaction within a "practico-discursive map" (p. 22) of "hegemonic human-nonhuman relations in contemporary Western cultures" (p. 28). One axis locates the degree of objectification or subjectification. The other axis measures the degree of sensibility (extending visibility and invisibility to the full range of sensation). Human animals are located at the highest levels of both subjectification and sensation. "Vermin", "meat" and "wild" animals occupy the extremes of the other quadrants, with other animals distributed at lesser extremes.

Cole and Stewart (pp. 31-32) then use a Weberian account of the modern struggle over sense making, i.e., meaningful social action, to identify how forms of human-nonhuman animal relations that appear to resist objectifications/non-sensibility (invisibility), are routinely re-incorporated into the dominant, hegemonic mode of instrumental rationality. They note Weber's four ideal typical modes of social action: instrumental rational action, value rational action, affective action and tradition (Weber, 1968 [1914]). Whilst Weber highlighted the driving force of instrumental rationalisation in the development of modern society, this "disenchantment of the world" (Weber, 1991a [1919]) was itself insufficient to account for all social action, nor was it sufficient to give meaning to any one individual's life (Weber, 2004 [1905]). Cole and Stewart (2014) identify farmed animals, laboratory animals and vermin

(citing Rentokil) as the paradigmatic examples of instrumentalized, non-sensible objects of instrumental rational action.

Other modes of meaningful relation exist—value-rational, affective and traditional; but Cole and Stewart illustrate that each is routinely subject to alignment back to the hegemonic instrumental framework. Animal welfare initiatives, laws and policies, offer a value rational approach to animals – seemingly treating animals as ends in themselves (moving them into the same quadrant as humans and pets in Cole and Stewart's practico-discursive map). However, such "welfare" models are subsumed largely within attempts to "improve" the quality of animal farming rather than challenging it. Likewise, affective (emotional) approaches to animals are routinely appropriated by instrumental drivers, such as in the language of "happy meals" and "comfort food." Affective identifications with animals are constructed mainly as childish, and thereby deemed immature in adults (with empathy being likewise dismissed as feminine). Similarly, tradition is regularly used as "window dressing" whereby modern farming practices are hidden behind a veneer of romantic nostalgia (Hillyard, 2007).

"So, in the light of Weber's typology, a reading of Figure 2.1 [Cole and Stewart's practico-discursive map] is that it depicts the triumph of instrumental-rational action, but often disguised as value-rational ('caring'…), affective action ('loving'…), or traditional action (rehearsing the rural idyll)" (Cole & Stewart, 2014, pp. 32-33). These authors are certainly correct to draw attention to the power of instrumental rational drivers in modern society, even in the ability to colonize (Habermas, 1986) non-instrumental modes of action and identification within their logic. Yet, Cole and Stewart also note that such relations are "contingent and inherently unstable" (p. 28). Whilst instrumental exploitation is "at root" (p. 18) or is "the bottom line" (p. 19) within today's hegemonic anthroparchal order, disruption can take place. Even if attempts will always be made to trivialize animal escapes and to incorporate human resistances to instrumental rational reduction, such attempts are not always successful. Just

because value-rational, affective and traditional challenges to instrumental rational reduction *can* be colonized does not mean they always *will* be. The map of oppression, which Cole and Stewart provide, must be used to resist colonization, and certainly not to objectify it. "Non-instrumental social action (value-rational, affective, or traditional)… prowls around the edges of our instrumentalized relations with animals, but is tamed as soon as it enters" (Cole & Stewart, 2014, p. 33). Activists, those that have a vocation for politics, must enter into the fray, even whilst not capitulating to the frame (Weber, 1991b [1919]).

The stability of compartmentalizing is uncertain. Enlightenment rationalism's claim that values should be founded on universal principles have provided a foundation for subsequent arguments in defence of non-human animals. Bentham's utilitarian rationalism led to both his instrumental rational Panopticon, and to his argument that animals' ability to feel pleasure and pain meant they were morally equal to human beings. Peter Singer's (1975) *Animal Liberation* builds specifically on Bentham's utilitarian calculus of the maximum happiness for the maximum number. In contrast, Tom Regan's (1983) *The Case for Animal Rights* argues for animal rights based on a Kantian categorical imperative that lives have inherent value, including those of non-human animals. Furthermore, it was arguably the romantic reaction to modernity that assigned affective qualities to nature, and therefore to animals. Tradition, too, is a modern invention and is always therefore being reinvented. Utilitarian, rights based, romantic and traditional conservationist frameworks of value rationality offer multiple foundations for action, but do not naturally cohere. It is only through activism that such threads can be woven together. Diverse foundations are both opportunity and challenge.

Modernity created the instrumental rational conditions for today's industrial farming and mechanized animal slaughter, but it also created the value rational, affective and nostalgic frames of meaningful social action that might oppose such practices. We should not dismiss

such challenges to instrumental rationality that exist within modern culture, as to do so would only replicate those attempts to marginalize them by the animal-industrial complex (Noske, 1989; Twine, 2012).

Joy (2010, p. 105) is right to say Western cultures largely normalize the consumption of meat. However, Western cultural norms are also contradictory. “It appears that when it comes to animals, our contradictory attitudes and practices are the norm” (Mizelle, 2015, p. 286). These contradictions in our norms regarding animals are mirrored by contradictions in our attitudes to other people as well. Sometimes action is taken on the premise that we choose and should do. On other occasions, we are told that it is merely “the way things are” and nothing can be done differently. “Naturalness” and “inevitability” conceal choices made in line with hegemonic ideologies such as what Cammaerts (2015) calls neoliberalism, and what Joy (2010) identifies as carnism.

Giving human names to animals turns them into symbolic humans. Classifying animals with names denoting function—“farm animals,” “live-stock,” “milk-cows,” “porkers,”—renders them down to their utility rather than as ends in themselves. Where the former anthropomorphizes animals, the latter naturalizes their reduction to human purposes. The paradoxical interplay of anthropomorphism and naturalization applies to both how humans regard animals and how humans regard other humans.

Animals routinely escape (Hribal, 2010). Allen and Von Essen (2018) discuss the significance of animal resistance, arguing that when animals escape from slaughterhouses, it is appropriate to describe this in social justice terms, as they become primary agents of resistance to their own exploitation.

Naturalisation seeks to render a particular state of affairs as natural, necessary and unavoidable, whether that be in relation to humans or in the treatment of animals. The extension of value rational or affective meaning to animals is rejected by some as anthropomorphism.

Arguments against relocating Dyson Appliances' factory were scarcely countenanced; redundancies were framed as a natural inevitability.

Conclusions

The name Chippenham is the fusion of market (ceap/chipp) and protected enclave (-ham). This article has explored the contradictions of this relationship. Dyson Appliances moved from Chippenham to Malmesbury, whilst the Tamworth two moved from Malmesbury to Chippenham. Who gets sent to market and who gets protected is open to dispute. At the time the events of this chapter were unfolding, Chippenham was in dispute with Parma Ham over market freedom versus the right to be protected from the market. The same dispute played out with Butch and Sundance, as was later the case with the Dyson Appliances' workers who had helped "save" them. In applying a CAMS analysis to the Tamworth two and Dyson Appliances, we have highlighted the close connection between capitalism, animal exploitation, and the way these connections play out in mainstream media-reporting via narratives of nature and inevitability. It is never enough to reproduce the "escape from slaughter" trope in animal liberation messaging, whereby specific individualised animals are presented as exceptional, and only thus worthy of identification and salvation because *we* have given them names, and because *we* have seen their faces. This may implicitly condemn nameless and countless others to an effaced fate.

Nevertheless, when animals resist, their action disrupts a routine that *we* can and must follow up on. We should work to build empathy and identification with the animals who do not manage to escape, as well as the ones that do. All are worthy of our concern. Invisibility and false reasoning underpin ideologies of naturalization and inevitability in relation to both speciesism and global capitalism. As such, activists should also continue to demonstrate the connections between the exploitation inherent in capitalism and animal exploitation as a means of building resistance to both. As Covid-19 has highlighted the catastrophic consequences of

intensive animal exploitation, activists must highlight that this is a global capitalist phenomenon, not just a one-off "aberration" (Joy, 2010, p. 104). We hope that in telling the story of the Tamworth two and their escape onto a global capitalist billionaire's land we have helped further reveal the connections between the logics of speciesism and global capitalism, and underlined the need to join-the-dots in the way we campaign for animals, be they human or non-human. Two pigs gained sanctuary from the market because they removed themselves from objectification, and were removed from object status in the media, whilst slaughter continued, invisible. Workers' jobs were sacrificed to global capitalism's fictional "state of nature," the market. Claiming nothing could be done, "it's a jungle out there," is an error.

References

Adorno, T. and Horkheimer, M. (1997). *The Dialectic of Enlightenment*. London: Verso.

Allen, M. and Von Essen, E. (2018). Animal Resistors: On the Right of Resistance and Human Duties of Non-Return and Abolition, *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, 15(6), 3–28.

Almiron, N., Cole, M. and Freeman, C. (2018). Critical Animal and Media Studies: Expanding the understanding of oppression in communication research. *European Journal of Communication*, 33(4), 367–380.

Baird, D. (2010, July 23). "The Sun: Flogging a Live Donkey." *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/media/organgrinder/2010/jul/23/the-sun-parasailing-donkey.

Bauman, Z. (1989). *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Cambridge: Polity.

BBC (2002, February 6). "Blair 'disappointed' over Dyson jobs.". Retrieved from http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/1805050.stm

Best, S. (2009). The rise of critical animal studies: Putting theory into action and animal liberation into higher education. *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, 7(1), 9–52.

Best, W. (1998, January 13). "Three little piggies went to market, but two went on the run, they saved their bacon with a swim in the Avon and now the farmer's looking glum." *Western Daily Press*. p. 3.

Cammaerts, B. (2015). Neoliberalism and the post-hegemonic war of position: the dialectic between invisibility and visibilities. *European Journal of Communication*, 30(5), 522–538.

Cole, M. and Stewart, K. (2014). *Our Children and Other Animals*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Colling, S. (2020). *Animal Resistance in the Global Capitalist Era*, East Lancing; Michigan State University Press.

Cservenka, E. (1998a, February 15). "Piggies on the run to save their bacon." *Wilts and Gloucestershire Standard.* [page number not present in archive copy]

Cservenka, E. (1998b, February 22). "Swine Fever." *Wilts and Gloucestershire Standard.* p. 5.

Cudworth, E. (2008). 'Most Farmers Prefer Blondes': The Dynamics of Anthroparchy in Animals' Becoming Meat, *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, 6(1), 32–45.

Cudworth, E. (2015). Killing animals: sociology, species relations and institutionalized violence. *The Sociological Review*, 63(1), 1–18.

David, M. and Sutton, C. (2011). *Social Research: An Introduction*. London: Sage.

Davis, K. (2004). A tale of two Holocausts. *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, 2(2), 6–25.

DeMello, M. (2012). *Animals and Society: An Introduction to Human-Animal Studies*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Fitzgerald, A. (2012). Doing Time in Slaughterhouses: A Green Criminological Commentary on Slaughterhouse Work Programs for Prison Inmates, *Journal for Critical Animal Studies,* 10(2), 12–46.

Garner, C. (1998, January 15). "Pigs flight to freedom brings promise of sanctuary." *The Independent*. p. 15.

Gibbs, G. (2002, February 5). "Dyson, champion of British industry, switches production to Far East." *The Guardian*, Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/business/2002/feb/06/manufacturing.globalrecession

Gill, O. (2019, February 18). Veganuary Blamed for January Pub Hangover, *The Telegraph,* https://www.telegraph.co.uk/business/2019/02/18/veganuary-blamed-january-pub-hangover/.

Gillespie, K. & Narayanan, Y. (2020). 'Animal Nationalisms: Multispecies Cultural Politics, Race, and the (Un)Making of the Settler Nation-State', *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 41:1, 1–7, DOI: 10.1080/07256868.2019.1704379

Gould, D. (2019). The Filmic Slaughterhouse. *Journal for Critical Animal Studies,* 16(1), 3–23.

Gow, D. (2003, November 8). "Dyson profits from Malaysian move." *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/business/2003/nov/08/4

Habermas, J. (1986). *The Theory of Communicative Action* (vols. I and II). Cambridge: Polity.

Harris, P. (1998, January 16). "WORLD OINKSCLUSIVE: How the Mail saved the bacon of the Tamworth Two". *The Daily Mail*. p. 2.

Hillyard, S. (2007). *The Sociology of Rural Life*. Oxford: Berg.

Hornsby, M. (1998, January 30) "Tamworth Two 'were right to flee abattoir'." *The Times*. [page number not present in archive copy]

Horrie, C. (2002, April 7). Gotcha! How the Sun reaped spoils of war, *The Observer*, Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/business/2002/apr/07/pressandpublishing.media

Hribal, J. (2010). *Fear of the Animal Planet: The Hidden History of Animal Resistance.* Oakland CA.: AK Press.

Jenni, C. (2005). The Power of the Visual. *Journal for Critical Animal Studies,* 3(1), 2–22.

Joy, M. (2010). *Why we love dogs, eat pigs and wear cows*. San Francisco: Conari Press.

Lazutkaite, E. (2020) *Re/Thinking Chickens: The Discourse around Chicken Farming in British Newspapers and Campaigners' Magazines, 1982 – 2016,* Wilmington DE: Vernon Press.

Martin, T.A. (2014). "This Image Cannot be Displayed": Critical Visual Pedagogy and Images from Factory Farms. *Journal for Critical Animal Studies,* 12(4), 79–104.

Maurizi, M. (2012). The Dialectical Animal: Nature and Philosophy of History in Adorno, Horkheimer and Marcuse. *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, 10(2), 67–103.

Mizelle, B. (2015). Unthinkable Visibility: Pigs, Pork, and the Spectacle of Killing and Meat. In Shaffer, M. S., and Young, P. S. K. (Eds.). *Rendering Nature: Animals, Bodies, Places, Politics* (pp. 264–287). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Molloy, C. (2011). *Popular Media and Animals*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Morgan, K. and Cole, M. (2011). The Discursive Representation of Nonhuman Animals in a Culture of Denial. In Carter, B. and Charles, N. (Eds.). *Human and Other Animals: Critical Perspectives* (pp. 264–287). Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Morris, S. (2004, March 1). "A crackling good yarn." *The Guardian*.. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/media/2004/mar/01/mondaymediasection1

Nibert, D. (2017). *Animal Oppression and Capitalism* [2 Volumes]. Santa Barbara CA: Praeger.

Noske, B. (1989). *Humans and Other Animals: Beyond the Boundaries of Anthropology*. London: Pluto.

Painter, C. (2014). The Analogy between the Holocaust and Animal Factory Farming: A Defence. *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, 12(1), 33–62.

Partington, A. and Zuccato, M. (2018). Europhobes, Europhiles, Eurospats and Eurojibes, in Čermáková, A. Mahlberg, M. (Eds) *The Corpus Linguistics Discourse*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 95–126.

Pearce, D. (2009). Dyson Cleans Up Again. IPKat Blog. 24 January. Retrieved from http://ipkitten.blogspot.com/2009/01/dyson-cleans-up-again.html

Regan, T. (1983). *The Case for Animal Rights*, California: University of California Press.

Sanders, B. (2018). Global Animal Slaughter Statistics And Charts, *Faunalytics*, Retrieved from https://faunalytics.org/global-animal-slaughter-statistics-and-charts/

Schattschneider, E. E. (1960). *The Semi-Sovereign People*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Shaffer, M. S. and Young, P. S. K. (2015). The Nature-Culture Paradox. In Shaffer, M. S., and Young, P. S. K. (Eds.). *Rendering Nature: Animals, Bodies, Places, Politics* (pp. 1–19). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Sinclair, U. (1906[1985]). *The Jungle*. New York: Penguin Classics.

Singer, P. (1975). *Animal Liberation*. New York: Harper Collins.

Stephens Griffin, N. (2020). #Notallcops: Exploring 'rotten apple' narratives in media reporting of Lush's 2018 'spycops' undercover policing campaign. *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy*. 9(4), 178–196. https://doi.org/10.5204/ijcjsd.v9i4.1518

Sunday Times, The (2020, May 17). “World Billionaires.” *The Sunday Times Magazine Rich List 2020,* p. 8.

Taylor, N. (2016). Suffering is not enough. In Almiron, N., Cole, M. and Freeman, C., (Eds.). *Critical Animal and Media Studies Communication for Nonhuman Animal Advocacy* (pp. 42–55). London: Routledge.

Twine, R. (2012). Revealing the Animal Industrial Complex- A Concept and Method for Critical Animal Studies? *Journal for Critical Animal Studies,* 10(1), 12–39.

Uhlig, R. (2002, February 6). “800 jobs to go as “sad” Dyson moves factory to Far East.” *The Daily Telegraph.* Retrieved from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/2752100/800-jobs-to-go-as-sad-Dyson-moves-factory-to-Far-East.html

Vallely, P. (1998, January 17). “How the flying pigs became a crackling good tale.” *The Independent*. p. 16.

Valler, D. (2002, February 7). “Workers speak of shock as 800 are brushed aside.” *Devizes Gazette and Herald.* p.10.

Weber, M. (1968[1914]). Basic Sociological Terms. In Roth, G. and Wittith, C., (Eds.). *Economy and Society* (pp. 3–62). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Weber, M. (1991[1919a]). Politics as a Vocation. In Gerth, H.H. and Mills, C. Wright, (Eds.). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (pp. 129–156). London: Routledge.

Weber, M. (1991[1919a]). Science as a Vocation. In Gerth, H.H. and Mills, C. Wright, (Eds.). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (pp. 129–156). London: Routledge.

Weber, M. (2004[1905]). *The Protestant Ethic and the ‘Spirit’ of Capitalism*. London: Penguin.

Wilson, R. (2012, October 12). “British Journalism’s greatest ever scoops: The Tamworth Two (Daily Mail, 1988).” *The Press Gazette*. https://www.pressgazette.co.uk/top-scoops-british-journalism-all-time-tamworth-two-daily-mail-1998